



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/787,103	07/25/2001	Julian J. Kennedy	KEN3/WAB	1365

7590 01/08/2003

William A Blake  
PO Box 2266 Eads Station  
Arlington, VA 22202

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

ENATSKY, AARON L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	3713

DATE MAILED: 01/08/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/787,103	KENNEDY ET AL
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Aaron L Enatsky	3713

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 64-84 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 64-84 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                    4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_ .
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                    5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ .                    6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. Examiner acknowledges receipt of amendment on 11/5/02. Claims 64 – 84 remain pending. Applicant's prior art statement of 9/14/1998 has been considered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 64-69, 73-79, 81, 83-84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pease et al. '076 (Hereafter, Pease) in view of Young et al. '552 (Young). Pease teaches the limitations of a gateway/location controller that facilitates communications between a central monitoring facility and a plurality of game machines (Fig. 1). All game activity data generated by game machines are sent through an appointed location controller to a central monitoring facility (2:20-54). However, Pease lacks the feature of a game machine doubling as a gateway/location controller. Young teaches features of a network game machines that send activity data to central monitoring systems (Figs. 1-3). Young also teaches that any game machine can be designated as a game server, thus operating as both a game machine and location controller for a plurality of game machines (6:9-28) and that the central computer can detect security events created at individual game machines (9:28-30). Pease and Young are related with respect to teaching central monitoring systems in network game configurations where one would

be motivated to modify Pease to include the features in Young to minimize amount of communication received by the central computer from various location controllers to facilitate the upward scaling of the network gaming system (Pease, 10:16-21).

Claims 70-72, 80, and 82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pease in view of Young as applied to claims 64-69, 73-79, 81, 83-84 above, and further in view of Hornbuckle '479. Pease in view of Young teach the limitations as discussed above, but do not address the limitations of a central computer sending a disabling signal to a remote terminal. Hornbuckle teaches a central computer that has the ability to control remote terminals, including sending a disabling signal to a connected remote terminal (2:19-25). Pease in view of Young and Hornbuckle are related as network entertainment systems that use central computers to control and monitor remote terminals. One would be motivated to modify Pease in view of Young to include the remote disabling feature taught by Hornbuckle so that if a system user has been negligent, system use can be terminated from a remote location (Hornbuckle, 2:23-24).

*Response to Arguments*

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 64-84 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

*Citation of Pertinent Prior Art*

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Sitrick '509 teaches a distributed network game system that has the feature of allowing a game machine to also act as a location controller/server.

Weiss '730 teaches remote monitoring of game terminal events and terminal disabling signals.

***Conclusion***

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aaron L Enatsky whose telephone number is 703-305-3525. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Valencia Martin-Wallace can be reached on 703-308-4119. The fax phone numbers

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9302 for regular communications and 703-872-9303 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1148.

Aaron Enatsky

December 31, 2002



JESSICA HARRISON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER